

knew his deed was wrong, let him step forward. Pray let him think first, however. Or, in the alternative, let him contemplate the other side to that Platonic coin: "The best partner for dice-playing is not a just man, but a good dice-player."

EDWARD DE GRAZIA†

WHITHER EUROPE—UNION OR PARTNERSHIP? By M. J. Bonn. New York: Philosophical Library, 1952. Pp. vii, 207. \$3.75.

IN George Bernard Shaw's *Joan of Arc*, Joan comes to see Charles VII. The English have occupied France, and Charles VII—a king who enjoys no one's confidence—has taken refuge at Bourges. When Joan seeks out the king, she brings nothing but her faith and her hope. She speaks and all the world mocks her. Generals, bishops, jurists all call her a madwoman until a young man, who is to become her companion in battle as well as in victory, says, "Let us trust in madmen. Look where the wise have got us."

Perhaps Joan's companion was right. Perhaps the world should now become a little mad, put aside "wisdom" and "reason," and believe that a little hope, a little confidence, and a little faith are of more use than all procedural wisdom. At least this reviewer felt this way before and even after reading Dr. Bonn's book.

The author, a distinguished economist and political scientist, deals realistically—and with many instructive parallels from the past—with the European Defense Treaty and other measures aimed at building western solidarity. He advocates instead a system of multiple partnerships, joint institutions, and limited working agreements. Viewing the whole problem in its historical context, he argues strongly against the need for western union on a federal pattern.

"Yet it is pretty clear that in the face of common danger—which is not likely to recede for a long time to come—the Western European countries must co-operate. They must pursue either an identical or a joint foreign policy. But they must forge their own instruments for this purpose; they cannot borrow from American history. Could they today consult the Founding Fathers, those great men would hardly advise them to imitate their work. They would say: 'Face your problems, which are of a different order than ours were, in the same spirit of inspired realism in which we tackled ours and you will succeed. Create, do not copy.'"¹

One wonders just how much Europeans need such a warning. When representatives from our Congress met with those of the Consultative Assembly

†Member, District of Columbia Bar.

1. P. 69.

of the Council of Europe in November, 1951, this point was often discussed; and it was answered, repeatedly in the same way: create, do not copy.²

Chapters I through IV of Dr. Bonn's book treat Europe in historical perspective. With chapter headings entitled "What is Europe?," "The Parting of the Continents," "The Partition of Europe," and "Atlantic Reunion," the author skillfully traces events leading up to the present schism between eastern and western Europe. He knows his history and uses it with telling effect in sifting the evidence and presenting the facts.

Chapter VI deals with various European compacts, agreements, and contracts—such as the German Confederation, the Habsburg Monarchy, and even the present-day U.S.S.R.—which demonstrate an historical pattern for European union. Nationality, says Dr. Bonn, is much better off in union than isolation. The fate that befell all the national states formed out of the Austrian empire should serve as a warning to the people of western Europe.

Chapter VII is a misnomer. Titled "Founders of Western Union," it says nothing of the founders. Instead, the author discusses the overseas colonies of the European powers and what effect they would have on European union. He concludes that the European powers "can hardly incorporate their *coordinated* empires in a Western European Union."³ His reasoning seems correct; yet there are still "madmen" at work in the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe trying to formulate an approach if not a solution to the problem of integrating colonial possessions into a European union. This attempt has been little publicized, however, because a political, economic, and military union of the nations themselves is the paramount issue today; the foundations of the house of Europe must be laid before the walls or roof can be put in place.

It is to be regretted that nothing is written either of the founders of European union or of past and present work aimed at achieving union, except for a brief discussion in a later chapter in the book. For it is the founders and those who have carried on the work who have given "birth to the most constructive idea evolved since the war."⁴

2. "I should like to say, first of all, to our American friends that Europe is not America, and that the twentieth century is not the eighteenth century. I, for my part, am quite convinced that the solution of the problem of Europe—and it is a great problem—is not to be found on precisely the same lines as the wonderful solution that their Founding Fathers once found for the problem of the North American Continent. The differences, for example, between the Baltic and the Mediterranean countries in outlook, in culture, in tradition, in language, and in standards of living are infinitely greater than those between the members of the Atlantic community at the present time." Robert Boothby, United Kingdom Conservative M.P., in the CONFERENCE OF STRASBOURG BETWEEN THE DELEGATIONS OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE, OFFICIAL RECORD OF DEBATES 39 (1951).

3. P. 91 (emphasis is author's).

4. Editorial, N.Y. Times, Sept. 12, 1952, p. 20, col. 1.

The idea is not new. It was the "Grand Design" of the Duke of Sully, chief adviser to Henry IV of France; and writers from Rousseau to Bentham developed it further. Aristide Briand, Edouard Herriot, and Count Coudenhove-Kalergi advocated the idea in the early Twenties and Thirties, but for a decade after that it lay dormant. Then at the end of World War II Europe's shattered economy and the peril of communism made it obvious that Europe must cooperate if it is to survive. A pro-union movement of private citizens in Europe had originated in war-time resistance groups. In 1949, following a Congress of Europe at The Hague, this movement led to a coalition—the European Movement—of almost all groups favoring union. The leaders of this new organization (Winston Churchill, Alcide de Gasperi, Robert Schuman, Leon Blum, and Paul-Henri Spaak) were so successful in lobbying for resolutions of the Congress of Europe, that a Council of Europe was created by ten governments in the same year.⁵ Since 1949 the Movement's constructive influence on deliberations of the Council's Consultative Assembly has been marked.

It was through the initiative of the European Movement that the job of drafting the Statute for a European Political Authority was assigned to the Schuman Assembly rather than to the Assembly of the European Defense Community, as originally contemplated. This procedure is expected to eliminate as much as a year's delay in drafting, since the Schuman Assembly opened its first session in September, whereas the E.D.C. Treaty has yet to be ratified.

The European Movement also has other projects which, taken together, constitute the most constructive and telling answer to communism yet devised by the free people of Europe. Through the Movement's efforts, virtually all major youth organizations in free Europe have, for the first time in history, made union a major concern of their individual activities. They have entered upon a large program of publications, conferences, seminars, and public demonstrations, coordinated by the Movement through a system of national councils in fifteen countries and an International Youth Council and Secretariat in Paris. In addition, a Referendum Campaign in the six continental countries of the Schuman plan is being sponsored by the European Movement. Signatures of hundreds of thousands of Europe's leading citizens are being gathered for a petition calling for the convening of a Constitutional Assembly to draft a European constitution. Test votes will be taken in Dutch towns on the question of whether or not to call such an assembly. If successful, similar action will be taken in all Schuman plan countries. Finally, a committee of prominent European jurists was organized last May to study the problems which will confront the continental countries in the establishment of a federal system and to prepare recommendations on the essential provisions of a federal constitution.

5. There are now 14 member nations: Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom.

These activities make up a large part of the public opinion campaign; a movement like this needs wide, divergent support. Whether the public as yet is prepared for such a revolutionary undertaking as a united Europe is still questionable. It is hoped that these efforts will help to take up the slack which now seems to exist between the politicians and the public, for the optimist is only a realist who perceives that in spite of old suspicions and new hesitations, the western world is solidifying because it must.

Because of Dr. Bonn's background as a financial advisor to the Weimar Republic, his chapters on Germany are most illuminating. In the solution to the German problem hangs the future of Europe and, to a large extent, that of the western world. The author analyzes the internal strains and stresses created by partition of Germany into two sections. He emphasizes both the political necessity and the danger of integrating Germany as armed and equal partner of the western world.

"Western Germany is, moreover, tied spiritually and economically to Western Berlin—the beleaguered yet morally the strongest bastion of the West—and at the same time separated geographically from it. Notwithstanding the stupendous energy by which this almost dead city has become the most alive centre on the Continent, its economic survival depends—like that of Western Germany—on the most intense co-operation of the entire Western World, and not merely on a fusion with her continental neighbours"⁶

But is this the only answer? There seem to this reviewer three possible approaches to this problem. One possibility is to neutralize and disarm Germany. This would mean that a European coalition would have to draw back to the Rhine. It would mean creating in the middle of Europe an immense vacuum to tempt an aggressor. It also means depriving the free world of hundreds of thousands of excellent soldiers at a time when they are in short supply.

There is another possibility: to allow Western Germany to go her own way. But this would permit Germany to regain, little by little, her army and large military staff, her absolute sovereignty, her entirely independent foreign policy, and her economic power, without outside limitations. Then wouldn't the same causes bring forth the same results—a repetition of 1914 and 1939? Thrown out of balance by the loss of eastern Germany, over-industrialized, over-populated, and with 10 million refugees, she could, with some justification, claim a larger "vital space" and would no doubt try to get it by tactics even worse than those used in the past.

The third possibility is to tell Germany: "You will not be permitted to recover your full sovereignty, your total independence, your autonomous foreign policy, your national army. You are obliged to make certain sacrifices at the altar of the new Europe. But at the same time the other countries of western Europe will also be making the same sacrifices, and together

6. P. 122.

we are going to create a new Europe, where our forces will be integrated and coordinated on every level. We are going to form a great political, military, and economic unity, the whole power of which will be put to the service of the western cause and its defense." There can be no guarantee that this experiment will work, but the only other possibilities will lead to chaos.

Dr. Bonn is sharply critical of the Schuman plan. "The Schuman plan was launched in a great hurry; it was, in fact, not much of a plan, but rather a proposal to join a conference for the elaboration of a plan, and to bind oneself to accept its findings."⁷ "The pact may well be described as a lawyer's delight and an economist's despair."⁸ The Schuman plan has been attacked from many quarters. But if there are valid criticisms of the plan, haste in drafting is not one of them. Jean Monnet, the present head of the High Authority, had discussed and worked out draft proposals years before the plan came into the public eye. In December, 1949, the Committee on Economic Questions of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe recommended such a scheme. (This recommendation grew out of an idea originally suggested at the Westminster Economic Conference of the European Movement.) Robert Schuman, French Foreign Minister, declared in a letter to the Council's Secretary General that the French government welcomed this proposal and hoped it would receive the attention of the Assembly. Then, in May, 1950, Schuman announced in the name of the French government his plan for the pooling of coal and steel resources throughout Europe. True, the plan has not been fully developed; moreover, there are dangers here, as in all great experiments, but the Schuman Treaty is above all an act of faith in the birth of a United Europe. And this reviewer is convinced that the "Schuman Plan represents the only practicable means for releasing the tremendous energies of the German people to the benefit not only of Germany but of the entire Western world."⁹

The author has made some factual errors. He states that the Assembly of the Council of Europe meets only once a year, while in fact it meets twice a year; that Germany is an associate member of the Council of Europe, when the fact is that in May, 1951, Germany became a full Council member. And some of the facts are already outdated, but events have moved so rapidly in the last few months that anyone writing a book on this subject is to be excused for factual gaps.

Dr. Bonn, a "good European" with a strong sense of history and tradition, has written a book that may be of some interest to scholars but probably not to the general public. What is now needed is a book for all the reading

7. P. 174.

8. P. 176.

9. Donovan, *The Schuman Plan: A Blow to Monopoly*, Atlantic Monthly, Feb., 1952, p. 58. This article, by a prominent lawyer and Chairman of the American Committee on United Europe, presents not only an American's views of the plan but an excellent discussion of the arguments in its favor.

public; it is time to present a balance sheet and show that Europe has progressed further in the last five years than in the preceding five hundred.

Peaceful revolutions are usually slow transitions, set in motion by one generation, completed by another. But this revolution in the political structure of western Europe moves with the speed of a violent upheaval. It is made by men in a hurry to finish the job. This is good news for the entire western world and particularly the United States; unity in Europe is crucial to the security of the United States and the free world. We should know more about this revolution and give it our full support.

WILLIAM K. COBLENTZ †

† Member, California Bar.